

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this Application. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 6 to define the claimed invention more particularly.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

With respect to the prior art rejections, claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Niikawa (US Patent No. 7,075,569) in view of Matherson et al. (US Patent No. 7,233,352).

I. STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

As a preliminary matter, Applicants' representative would like to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended in the personal interview conducted on December 4, 2007.

An Examiner's Interview Summary Record (PTOL-413) was provided by the Examiner at the interview on December 4, 2007.

Applicant submits this Statement to comply with the requirements of M.P.E.P. '713.04.

In the interview, the following was discussed:

A. Identification of claims discussed:

Claims 1-21.

B. Identification of prior art discussed:

Niikawa (US Patent No. 7,075,569)

Matherson et al. (US Patent No. 7,233,352)

C. Identification of principal proposed amendments:

None.

D. Brief Identification of principal arguments:

Applicants' representative discussed the Examiner's claim rejection. Applicants' representative also described the devices in Niikawa and Atherson et al., and argues that Niikawa and Atherson et al., even if combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

That is, Niikawa and Atherson et al. do not teach or suggest "*generating the shading correction condition and the white balance adjustment condition for correcting the image signal to be generated at a time of actual imaging*," (emphasis added by Applicants) as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 6.

The Examiner agreed that Niikawa does not teach or suggest this calibration process.

Although in the Office Action the Examiner relied on Niikawa for disclosing this feature, the Examiner alleged that Atherson et al. disclose a calibration process similar to the claimed invention.

Applicants' representative respectfully pointed out that Niikawa and Atherson et al. do not teach or suggest, "*manual white balance adjustment*," as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 6.

The Examiner referred to col. 55, lines 56-61 of Niikawa that teaches a white balance adjustment process, which is performed by pressing half way down the shutter speed.

Applicants' representative argued that the invention does not use Niikawa's mechanism for the white balance adjustment, and referred to the operating unit 64 and the auto/manual white balance adjustment switch 62 in Fig. 1 of the invention.

The Examiner recommended, for clarity, amending the independent claims to recite, "*automatic/manual white balance switch*," to overcome the rejection.

E. Results of the Interview:

In response to the arguments presented, the Examiner agreed that addition of an automatic/manual white balance switch will overcome the rejection.

F. Conclusion:

The Examiner agreed that amending the claims, by adding *an automatic/manual white balance switch* to the independent claims, will overcome the rejection. The Examiner stated that he would review the Amendment that will be filed in view of the arguments made at the interview.

II. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-21, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 12/11/07

Farhad Shir
Farhad Shir, Ph.D.
Registration No. 59,403

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254